

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this application.

Claims 19-21 and 23-57 are currently pending in this application

35 U.S.C. § 112 Rejections

Claims (23, 40, 48), (24, 41, 49), (25, 42, 50), (26-27, 51), (30-31, 53), (36-38, 46, 56) are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement.

In response, Applicant has amended rejected claims to recite a computer readable storage medium. Applicant respectfully directs the Examiner's attention to Figure 1 and page 9 of the application as originally filed, which describes a computer memory, such as random access memory. It is well known in the art that a computer memory is hardware and is a computer readable storage device. Applicant respectfully submits that the written description requirement is satisfied.

In light of the foregoing arguments, Applicant respectfully submits that claims (23, 40, 48), (24, 41, 49), (25, 42, 50), (26-27, 51), (30-31, 53), (36-38, 46, 56) comply with the written description under the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. §112.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §112

Claims 23-57 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention.

It is widely known in the art that a computer readable storage medium may be a memory, such as the memory described on page 9 of the specification as originally filed. Accordingly, the claim language is definite. Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection.

The Examiner also rejects the claim language "satisfy a specified criteria," as being unclear, stating, "it does not know what a specified criteria is." Applicant respectfully submits that the criteria itself is not being claimed and that the language is not unclear. The claim is directed toward **satisfying** a specified criteria. The particular criteria is not being claimed, but rather the state of the specified criteria being satisfied. Accordingly, the claimed language is not unclear. Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §101

Claims (23, 40, 48), (24, 41, 49), (25, 42, 50), (26-27, 51), (30-31, 53), (36-38, 46, 56) were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

The Federal Circuit has stated that a computer readable storage medium cannot be properly interpreted as covering a signal or carrier wave. Accordingly, the rejected claims are directed to hardware, which is statutory. Applicant

respectfully submits that the claims are therefore directed to statutory subject matter and respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §101.

35 U.S.C. § 102 Rejections

Claims 23, 28-31, 40, 43-44, 48, 52-53 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Hamakawa et al. (hereinafter "Hamakawa"), "Object Composition and Playback Models for Handling Multimedia Data", Proceedings of the first ACM International Conference on Multimedia, Pages: 273-281, August 1993.

Claim 23 recites:

displaying a starting state of multimedia content;

determining automatically, by the computer, which recorded actions

satisfy a specified criteria; and

identifying a plurality of redundant determined recorded actions;

replacing the plurality of redundant determined recorded actions with a

summarized determined recorded action; and

playing back a sequence of only those determined recorded actions in

chronological order on an output device during a development of

content.

On page 8 of the Office Action, the Examiner equates the claimed actions with Hamakawa's frames of video data during video playing. Applicant

respectfully maintains that the recorded actions are not frames of video data. Even assuming, arguendo, that Hamakawa's frames are equivalent to the claimed actions, claim 23, as amended, recites identifying redundant actions and replacing the redundant actions with a single summarized action. Nowhere does Hamakawa disclose any such identification or summarization. Indeed, Hamakawa's exclusive focus is on calling the playback method **more** frequently than there is video data to be provided. Thus, Hamakawa is, at most, directed in the opposite direction from the claimed invention, which seeks to identify redundant actions and replace those redundant actions with a single summarized action. Accordingly, Hamakawa fails to disclose the claimed limitations and fails to anticipate the invention as claimed in claim 23.

Claims 23, 28, and 30 recite similar limitations and are patentable over Hamakawa for at least the reasons stated above.

In light of the foregoing arguments, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 23, 28-31, 40, 43-44, 48, 52-53 are not anticipated by Hamakawa, and respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(b).

35 U.S.C. § 102 Rejections

Claims 19-21, 23-39, 40-57 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Hardman et al. (Hardman), "Structures Multimedia Authorizing",

Proceedings of the first ACM International Conference on Multimedia, Pages:
283-289, August 1993.

Claim 19 recites:

receiving one or more user events during the development of the software
content;

determining which events and sequences of events constitute actions;

determining, by the computer system, whether an explanation
accompanies an action;

recording the determined actions during the development of the software
content if a user preference specifies that the determined actions are
to be recorded; and

recording the determined explanations such that a recorded explanation
of a recorded action is associated with the recorded action.

On page 10 of the Office Action, the Examiner takes the position that Hardman discloses the claimed "determining which events and sequences of events constitute actions" on page 286. The Examiner states, "walking route sequence, within hierarchy view, the author can select any object." Applicant respectfully submits that the ability to select an object does not disclose the claimed limitation. Selecting an object does not determine anything other than the currently selected object. The mere act of selecting an object does not disclose, in any way, the determining whether an event constitutes an action. The mere act

of selecting an object most certainly does not determine whether a **sequence** of events constitutes an action, since a single selected object **cannot be a sequence**. Thus, Hardman fails to disclose the claimed limitation.

Also on page 10 of the Office Action, the Examiner takes the position that Hardman discloses the claimed "recording the determined actions during the development of the software content" on page 286. The Examiner cites to no particular language, but merely refers the Applicant to section 4.3 of Hardman. However, section 4.3 discloses only a **player** of multimedia content. The claimed limitation is directed to **recording actions**. Applicant respectfully submits that Hardman's playing of multimedia content is completely irrelevant to the claimed **recording** of actions.

Furthermore, Applicant has amended claim 19 to recite recording the determined actions during the development of the software content if a user preference specifies that the determined actions are to be recorded. Even assuming, *arguendo*, that section 4.3 of Hardman discloses recording actions, it is absolutely silent as to whether to record an action based on a user preference. Indeed, since section 4.3 speaks only to **playing** multimedia content, by definition any content addressed by the section **has already been recorded**. Therefore, Hardman fails to disclose the claimed limitation and fails to anticipate the invention as claimed in claim 19. Claims 35, 36, and 39 contain similar limitations and are patentable over Hardman at least for the reasons stated above.

Claim 23 recites:

displaying a starting state of multimedia content;

determining automatically, by the computer, which recorded actions
satisfy a specified criteria; ~~and~~

identifying a plurality of redundant determined recorded actions;

replacing the plurality of redundant determined recorded actions with a
summarized determined recorded action; and

playing back a sequence of only those determined recorded actions in
chronological order on an output device during a development of
content.

The Examiner takes the position that Hardman discloses "determining automatically, by the computer which recorded actions satisfy a specified criteria." However, the portion of Hardman referred to by the Examiner deals with authoring multimedia content by a human user. Indeed, the table of contents disclosed by Hardman lays out the order of content in the presentation example provided by Hardman. However, it was **not** automatically determined by a computer, but rather, it was **authored by a human being**. Thus, Hardman fails to disclose the claimed limitation.

Furthermore, Applicant has amended claim 23 to recite identifying redundant actions and replacing the redundant actions with a single summarized action. Nowhere does Hardman disclose anything even resembling the identification of redundant actions (nor would it, since the human operator is

inputting the actions) and nowhere does Hardman disclose replacing redundant actions with a summarized action. Therefore, Hardman fails to disclose the claimed limitations and fails to anticipate the invention as claimed in claim 23.

Claims 24, 25, 26, 28, 30, and 32 contain similar limitations and are patentable over Hardman for at least the reasons stated above.

In light of the foregoing arguments, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 19-21, 23-39, 40-57 are not anticipated by Hardman, and respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(b).


For the foregoing reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that the applicable objections and rejections have been overcome and that the claims are in condition for allowance.

Please charge any shortages and credit any overcharges to our Deposit Account No. 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Date: November 6, 2008



James C. Scheller, Jr.
Reg. No. 31,195

1279 OAKMEAD PARKWAY
SUNNYVALE, CA 94085-4040
(408) 720-8300